DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 384 TM 001 318

AUTHOR Lord, Frederic M.; Hamilton, Martha S.
TITLE An Interval Estimate for Statistical Inference about True Scores.
INSTITUTION Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Naval Research, Washington, D.C. Personnel and Training Research Programs Office.
REPORT NO RB-72-1
PUB DATE Jan 72
NOTE 17p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Bayesian Statistics; *Hypothesis Testing; *Mental Tests; *Statistical Analysis; Tests of Significance; Theories; *True Scores

ABSTRACT

A numerical procedure is outlined for obtaining an interval estimate of true score. The procedure is applied to several sets of test data. (Author)

RB-72-1

AN INTERVAL ESTIMATE FOR STATISTICAL INFERENCE ABOUT TRUE SCORES

Frederic M. Lord

and

Martha S. Hamilton

This research was sponsored in part by the
Personnel and Training Research Programs
Psychological Sciences Division
Office of Naval Research, under
Contract No. N00014-69-C-0017

Contract Authority Identification Number
NR No. 150-303

Frederic M. Lord, Principal Investigator

Educational Testing Service

Princeton, New Jersey

January 1972

AN INTERVAL ESTIMATE FOR STATISTICAL INFERENCE ABOUT TRUE SCORES

Frederic M. Lord

and

Martha S. Hamilton

This research was sponsored in part by the
Personnel and Training Research Programs
Psychological Sciences Division
Office of Naval Research, under
Contract No. N00014-69-C-0017

Contract Authority Identification Number
NR No. 150-303

Frederic M. Lord, Principal Investigator

Educational Testing Service

Princeton, New Jersey

January 1972

AN INTERVAL ESTIMATE FOR STATISTICAL INFERENCE ABOUT TRUE SCORES

Frederic M. Lord and Martha S. Hamilton

Abstract

A numerical procedure is outlined for obtaining an interval estimate of true score. The procedure is applied to several sets of test data.

AN INTERVAL ESTIMATE FOR STATISTICAL INFERENCE ABOUT TRUE SCORES*

We wish to infer the true score of an individual examinee in a group of examinees from his observed score. The distribution of observed scores for a given true score is assumed to be binomial. If the distribution of true scores were known, the usual (Bayes) estimator of true score from observed score would be given by the regression of true score on observed score. If the distribution of true scores is unknown, which is always the case with real data, this regression is not uniquely determined by the observed-score distribution, even in an infinitely large population of examinees (Lord & Novick, 1968, section 23.5).

In practice, the regression function of observed-score on true score is frequently assumed to be linear. This assumption can be correct only if the unconditional observed-score distribution is negative hypergeometric. For any set of real data, then, the question arises--what limits or bounds can be placed on this regression under the binomial error model without making linearity assumptions? This paper presents a technique for computing an interval estimate of the regression function of true score on observed score under the binomial error model. The procedure is not simple. Our main interest here is to demonstrate the range of reasonable estimates of true scores than can be obtained from a set of data.

The same technique is applicable to problems outside of mental test theory whenever there is a set of true values and a set of binomial errors of measurement. This more general empirical Bayes problem, not related to mental test theory, is discussed separately (Lord, 1971).

*This research was sponsored in part by the Personnel and Training Research Programs, Psychological Sciences Division, Office of Naval Research, under Contract No. N00014-69-C-0017, Contract Authority Identification Number, NR No. 150-303, and Educational Testing Service. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

The Model

The observed score x is assumed to be an integer $0,1,2,\ldots,n$, where n is the number of items in the test. For each x there is an unobservable true score ζ, $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$. The difference between x and $n\zeta$ represents error of measurement. For a given ζ, x has the binomial distribution

$$h(x|\zeta) = \binom{n}{x} \zeta^x (1-\zeta)^{n-x} \quad , \qquad x = 0,1,\ldots,n \quad . \tag{1}$$

A sample of N observations on x is drawn at random from some population of pairs (x, ζ). We observe x, but not the corresponding ζ. We wish to estimate the true score ζ corresponding to a particular observed score x.

Let $G(\zeta)$ be the unknown cumulative distribution function of true scores for the population from which the N sample observations were drawn. The relative frequency distribution of observed scores for the population may be written

$$\phi_G(x) = \int_0^1 h(x|\zeta)\, dG(\zeta) \quad , \qquad x = 0,1,\ldots,n \quad . \tag{2}$$

If $G(\zeta)$ were known, the usual Bayes estimate of the true score for a particular observed score would be the regression of true score on observed score,

$$\mu_{\zeta|x} = \frac{1}{\phi_G(x)} \int_0^1 \zeta\, h(x|\zeta)\, dG(\zeta) \quad , \qquad x = 0,1,\ldots,n \quad . \tag{3}$$

If a good estimate $\hat{G}(\zeta)$ of $G(\zeta)$ can be found, then the corresponding estimate $\hat{\mu}_{\zeta|x}$ can be used as the empirical Bayes estimate of ζ for any particular x. A number of techniques are available for constructing

reasonable estimates $\hat{\mu}_{\zeta|x}$ from the observed-score distribution (for example, Robbins, 1956; Maritz, 1966; Copas, 1969; Griffin & Krutchkoff, 1971), but they are of unknown accuracy for any given N and n . The technique presented here constructs an interval with lower bound $\underline{\mu}_{\alpha x}$ and upper bound $\bar{\mu}_{\alpha x}$ within which $\mu_{\zeta|x}$ must lie in order to be "reasonably consistent" with the sample of observed scores.

Let the sample relative observed frequency distribution be $f(x)$, $x = 0,1,\ldots,n$. Consider $\chi^2_{1-\alpha}$ to be the $1 - \alpha$ percentile of the chi-square distribution with n degrees of freedom. A $G(\zeta)$ will be considered reasonably consistent with the data if the chi-square between the corresponding $\phi_G(x)$ defined by (2) and the given $f(x)$ is less than or equal to $\chi^2_{1-\alpha}$:

$$\chi^2_G = \sum_{x=0}^{n} \frac{N[f(x) - \phi_G(x)]^2}{\phi_G(x)} \leq \chi^2_{1-\alpha} \quad . \tag{4}$$

Let Γ_α be the set of all cumulative distribution functions $G(\zeta)$ that satisfy (4). The problem to be solved may then be stated as follows: For each $x = 0,1,\ldots,n$, find $\underline{\mu}_{\alpha x}$, the smallest $\mu_{\zeta|x}$, and $\bar{\mu}_{\alpha x}$, the largest $\mu_{\zeta|x}$ obtainable from (3) under the restriction that $G(\zeta)$ be in Γ_α .

By its construction, the interval $(\underline{\mu}_{\alpha x}, \bar{\mu}_{\alpha x})$ can be considered a confidence interval. With probability at least $1 - \alpha$, it will contain the true value of the regression in the population from which the sample was drawn. This procedure for constructing a confidence interval is not entirely satisfactory, since only a lower bound for the confidence level is known. Until better procedures are developed, however, the interval provides more information about the accuracy of inference about true scores than would otherwise be available.

Constructing the Confidence Interval

Substituting (1) into (2) and expanding gives

$$\phi_G(x) = \binom{n}{x} \sum_{r=0}^{n-x} \binom{n-x}{r}(-1)^r \mu_{x+r} \quad , \qquad x = 0,1,\ldots,n \quad , \tag{5}$$

where μ_k is the k -th moment of $G(\zeta)$ about the origin.

Substituting (1) and (5) in (3) and again expanding gives

$$\mu_{\zeta|x} = \frac{\sum_{r=0}^{n-x} \binom{n-x}{r}(-1)^r \mu_{x+r+1}}{\sum_{r=0}^{n-x} \binom{n-x}{r}(-1)^r \mu_{x+r}} \quad , \qquad x = 0,1,\ldots,n \quad . \tag{6}$$

Using a theorem by Markov (see Possé, 1886, sections V8 and V9; or Karlin & Shapley, 1953) and equation (6) it can be shown (Lord, 1971) that $\underline{\mu}_{\alpha x}$ or $\bar{\mu}_{\alpha x}$ is attained for a given x only when $G(\zeta)$ is a step function. A step function is a cumulative distribution function which arises when discrete probabilities g_v, $v=1,\ldots V$ are concentrated at points ζ_v, $v=1,\ldots,V$. The theorem also proves that if n , the number of test items, is even, V , the number of different points, will be at most $\frac{n}{2} + 1$. The situation is similar when n is odd, but will not be detailed here. In addition, the theorem by Markov shows that if $(n - x)$ is even, $\underline{\mu}_{\alpha x}$ is attained only when the smallest ζ_v is 0.0, and $\bar{\mu}_{\alpha x}$ is attained only when the largest ζ_v is 1.0. Similarly, if $(n - x)$ is odd, $\underline{\mu}_{\alpha x}$ is attained only when the largest ζ_v is 1.0, and $\bar{\mu}_{\alpha x}$ is attained only when the smallest ζ_v is 0.0.

Thanks to Markov, the problem has now taken on a simpler form. To find $\underline{\mu}_{\alpha x}$ or $\bar{\mu}_{\alpha x}$, only $\frac{n}{2}$ unknown true scores ζ_v need be found. Similarly, since the sum of all probabilities, g_v , must be 1, only $\frac{n}{2}$ unknown probabilities need be found. The problem simplifies further since it can be shown (Lord, 1971) that the solution lies on the boundary defined by $\chi^2_G = \chi^2_{1-\alpha}$, therefore the inequality of equation (4) can be replaced by strict equality.

When $G(\zeta)$ is a step function, (3) can be written as

$$\mu_{\zeta|x} = \frac{\sum_{v=1}^{V} g_v \zeta_v \, h(x|\zeta_v)}{\sum_{v=1}^{V} g_v \, h(x|\zeta_v)} \quad , \tag{7}$$

where $V = \frac{n}{2} + 1$. The problem is to maximize or minimize $\mu_{\zeta|x}$ given by equation (7), subject to the restrictions imposed by (4), by $\sum_{v=1}^{V} g_v = 1.0$ and by the inequalities $0 \leq g_v \leq 1.0$, $0 \leq \zeta_v \leq 1.0$. This problem can be solved numerically for any given observed score distribution by mathematical programming algorithms implemented on a computer.

The algorithm used to find the numerical solution to the problem was the sequential unconstrained minimization technique (SUMT) developed by Fiacco and McCormick (1968, Chapter 4) and implemented by M. Hamilton. This algorithm carries out a constrained minimization of a function (equation (7)) by performing a series of unconstrained minimizations. The unconstrained minima converge to the constrained minimum. Each unconstrained minimization minimizes the sum of the function and some penalty function. The penalty function is constructed to be large when a constraint is violated and small when it is not violated. The penalty function used here restricts $G(\zeta)$ to Γ_α . The other restrictions were handled by simpler means. The required minimization of the unconstrained function was accomplished by the Fletcher-Powell-Davidon algorithm (Fletcher & Powell, 1963), programmed by Jöreskog 1967, (section 8) and modified by Hamilton. All computations were performed on an IBM 360/65 in double precision.

Results

This procedure has been applied to a variety of mental test data. The tests presented here were selected for their unusual features. The values of α were chosen for convenience of computation.

Table 1. Observed cumulative frequency distribution and corresponding interval estimates ($\alpha = 0.086$) for the regression of true score on observed score.

x	Cumulative Distribution of x	$\hat{\mu}_{\zeta \mid x}$	Interval Estimate of the Regression
30	1.000	.970	.606-1.000
24	.999	.713	.595-.792
18	.945	.544	.498-.596
12	.741	.371	.342-.395
6	.249	.237	.216-.255
0	.001	.137	.009-.220

<u>Data set 1.</u> One such test consisted of 30 five-choice items administered to 2385 examinees. Table 1, column 2, shows the cumulative observed frequency distribution after random responses have been supplied for omitted items. This test is of particular interest since one-fourth of the examinees had scores at the chance level $(x = 6)$ or below, with one-sixth of the scores below chance.

The presence of so many people at or below the chance level raises a number of questions about the distribution of true scores. Are most or many of the true scores also at or below the chance level? Do some people score systematically lower than if they responded at random? What proportion of examinees can safely be assumed to have true scores above chance level?

The last column shows, for selected values of x, the interval estimates of the regression obtained by the method outlined in this paper for $\alpha = 0.086$. Since the regression function is to be used as giving the estimated true score for a given observed score, one can see the range of estimates that could reasonably be so used. The intervals demonstrate clearly that real differences exist on the dimension tested in spite of all the guessing. One cannot rule out the presence of true scores below the chance level, or of very high true scores.

For observed scores of 12 and 6, the intervals are tolerably short. It is interesting to note that for $x \leq .2n$, the interval estimate lies above x/n; for $x \geq .4n$, the interval estimate lies below x/n. This would seem to be a rather extreme manifestation of regression towards the mean.

It is easily shown that a straight-line regression can fit inside all of the intervals. However, this is not a sensitive test for linearity of regression. Under the binomial error model considered here, linearity necessarily leads to a negative hypergeometric distribution of observed scores (Lord & Novick, 1968, section 23.6). To test for linearity, a negative hypergeometric distribution was fitted to the observed score distribution. The χ^2 obtained for this fit was far beyond the tabled 99.9 percentile. Thus, the hypothesis of a linear regression of true score on observed score

cannot be maintained for these data.

The third column of Table 1 gives the (nonlinear) regression, obtained some years ago by a very different approach (Lord, 1969), for a $\hat{G}(\zeta)$ that produced a good fit to the observed-score distribution (the χ^2 between $\phi_{\hat{G}}(x)$ and $f(x)$ was at the 60th percentile, with 19 degrees of freedom). It is reassuring to find that this regression lies well within the interval estimates shown in the last column.

Data set 2. The technique was applied to another set of data consisting of the responses to 38 five-choice engineering items administered to 717 examinees. The mean number-right score on this subtest was 12. The subtest has spectacularly low reliability: the Kuder-Richardson coefficient KR_{20} is only 0.35. (The reason for such low reliability may be that the questions covered different engineering specialities--such as mechanical, electrical, or chemical engineering--but most examinees were familiar with only one speciality.)

Interval estimates of the regression of true score on observed score were computed for five observed scores, with $\alpha = 0.01$. The results are shown below:

Observed score x :	2	7	12	17	22
Cumulative distribution of x :	.001	.073	.591	.934	.997
Interval estimate of the regression:	.022-.321	.246-.321	.289-.332	.315-.407	.330-.596

All of these intervals contain at least one value in the range 0.32 to 0.33, which leaves open the remote possibility that examinees with observed scores throughout the range $2 \leq x \leq 22$ may all have about the same true score. This lack of discrimination is in agreement with the low test reliability. Zero reliability would imply that all true scores were identical, the variation of observed scores being entirely due to errors of measurement. A direct test of the hypothesis of zero reliability is called for if this hypothesis is of interest.

Data set 3. The effect of large sample size on the width of the interval estimate was investigated by using the scores of 137,052 examinees on a test composed of 50 five-choice math items. Using $\alpha = 0.05$, the interval estimate computed for the median ($x = 25$) of the distribution of number-right scores was found to be 0.496-0.509, a satisfyingly short interval. Calculations for other x values were not done (because of the expense, due to the large n).

Data set 4. In order to check further the efficacy of the interval estimates of regression, a set of hypothetical data was used. The observed relative frequency distribution was constructed by selecting 1000 cases at random from a negative hypergeometric distribution with $n = 24$. Table 2, column 2, shows the cumulative frequency distribution obtained.

The fifth column displays the interval estimates of the regression for seven values of x , with $\alpha = 0.0375$. Since the population distribution from which the sample was drawn was negative hypergeometric, the data are consisistent under the binomial error model with the assumption that the population regression is linear. The actual linear regression for the population was computed and is shown in column 4 of the table. Clearly, the interval estimate in column 5 recovers the information about the population linear regression. In fact, the values of the population linear regression differ from the midpoints of the intervals by a maximum of 0.019.

Data set 5. The third column of this table displays the cumulative frequency distribution of 50 cases that were selected at random from the 1000. Column 6 shows the corresponding interval estimates of the regression. As expected, the intervals are much wider than those for the original 1000 cases, but not $\sqrt{1000}/\sqrt{50} = 4.4$ times as wide. The width of the interval is doubled or tripled.

Table 2. Observed cumulative frequency distribution and interval estimates for hypothetical data, $\alpha = 0.0375$.

x	Cumulative Distribution of x, N=1000	Cumulative Distribution of x, N=50	$\mu_{\zeta\|x}$	$(\underline{\mu}_{\alpha x}, \bar{\mu}_{\alpha x})$ for N=1000	$(\underline{\mu}_{\alpha x}, \bar{\mu}_{\alpha x})$ for N=50
24	1.000	1.00	.900	.765-.998	.643-1.000
20	.954	.96	.767	.705-.822	.611-.868
16	.795	.72	.633	.575-.675	.532-.742
12	.523	.48	.500	.467-.558	.404-.618
8	.265	.22	.367	.310-.409	.258-.528
4	.072	.06	.233	.185-.297	.093-.454
0	.002	.00	.100	.009-.216	.000-.454

References

Copas, J. B. Compound decisions and empirical Bayes. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B, 1969, 31, 397-425.

Fiacco, A. V., & McCormick, G. P. Nonlinear programming: Sequential unconstrained minimization techniques. New York: Wiley, 1968.

Fletcher, R., & Powell, M. J. D. A rapidly convergent descent method for minimization. Computer Journal, 1963, 2, 163-168.

Griffin, B. S., & Krutchkoff, G. Optimal linear estimators: An empirical Bayes version with application to the binomial distribution. Biometrika, 1971, 58, 195-201.

Jöreskog, K. G. Some contributions to maximum likelihood factor analysis. Psychometrika, 1967, 32, 443-482.

Karlin, S., & Shapley, L. S. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society. Number 12. Geometry of moment spaces. Providence: American Mathematical Society, 1953.

Lord, F. M. Estimating true-score distributions in psychological testing (an empirical Bayes estimation problem). Psychometrika, 1969, 34, 259-299.

Lord, F. M. A numerical empirical Bayes procedure for finding an interval estimate. Research Bulletin 71-46 and ONR Technical Report, Contract N00014-69-C-0017. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1971.

Lord, F. M., & Novick, M. R. Statistical theories of mental test scores. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Maritz, J. S. Smooth empirical Bayes estimation for one-parameter discrete distributions. Biometrika, 1966, 53, 417-429.

Possé, C. _Sur quelques applications des fractions continues algébriques_. St. Pétersbourg, Russie: L'Académie Impériale des Sciences, 1886.

Robbins, H. An empirical Bayes approach to statistics. In J. Neyman (Ed.), _Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability_. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956. Pp. 157-164.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

NAVY

4 Director, Personnel and Training
Research Programs
Office of Naval Research
Arlington, VA 22217

1 Director
ONR Branch Office
495 Summer Street
Boston, MA 02210

1 Director
ONR Branch Office
1030 East Green Street
Pasadena, CA 91101

1 Director
ONR Branch Office
536 South Clark Street
Chicago, IL 60605

1 Office of Naval Research
Area Office
207 West 24th Street
New York, NY 10011

1 Commander
Operational Test and Evaluation Force
U. S. Naval Base
Norfolk, VA 23511

6 Director
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, D. C. 20390
ATTN: Library, Code 2029 (ONRL)

6 Director
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, D. C. 20390
ATTN: Technical Information Division

12 Defense Documentation Center
Cameron Station, Building 5
5010 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

1 Behavioral Sciences Department
Naval Medical Research Institute
National Naval Medical Center
Bethesda, MD 20014

1 Chief
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery
Code 513
Washington, D. C. 20390

1 Chief
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery
Research Division (Code 713)
Department of the Navy
Washington, D. C. 20390

1 Commanding Officer
Naval Medical Neuropsychiatric
Research Unit
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Director
Education and Training Sciences
Department
Naval Medical Research Institute
National Naval Medical Center
Building 142
Bethesda, MD 20014

1 Technical Reference Library
Naval Medical Research Institute
National Naval Medical Center
Bethesda, MD 20014

1 Chief of Naval Training
Naval Air Station
Pensacola, FL 32508
ATTN: Capt. Allen E. McMichael

1 Mr. S. Friedman
Special Assistant for Research & Studies
OASN (M&RA)
The Pentagon, Room 4E794
Washington, D. C. 20350

1 Chief
Naval Air Technical Training
Naval Air Station
Memphis, TN 38115

1 Chief of Naval Operations (Op-98)
Department of the Navy
Washington, D. C. 20350
ATTN: Dr. J. J. Collins

2 Technical Director
Personnel Research Division
Bureau of Naval Personnel
Washington, D. C. 20370

2 Technical Library (Pers-11B)
Bureau of Naval Personnel
Department of the Navy
Washington, D. C. 20360

1 Technical Director
Naval Personnel Research and
Development Laboratory
Washington Navy Yard, Building 200
Washington, D. C. 20390

3 Commanding Officer
Naval Personnel and Training Research
Laboratory
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Chairman
Behavioral Science Department
Naval Command and Management Division
U. S. Naval Academy
Luce Hall
Annapolis, MD 21402

1 Superintendent
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940
ATTN: Library (Code 2124)

1 Commanding Officer
Service School Command
U. S. Naval Training Center
San Diego, CA 92133

1 Research Director, Code 06
Research and Evaluation Department
U. S. Naval Examining Center
Building 2711 - Green Bay Area
Great Lakes, IL 60088
ATTN: C. S. Winiewicz

1 Commander
Submarine Development Group Two
Fleet Post Office
New York, NY 09501

1 Mr. George N. Graine
Naval Ship Systems Command (SHIP 03H)
Department of the Navy
Washington, D. C. 20360

1 Head, Personnel Measurement Staff
Capital Area Personnel Service Office
Ballston Tower #2, Room 1204
801 N. Randolph Street
Arlington, VA 22203

1 Col. George Caridakis
Director, Office of Manpower Utilization
Headquarters, Marine Corps (A01H)
MCB
Quantico, VA 22134

1 Col. James Marsh, USMC
Headquarters Marine Corps (A01M)
Washington, D. C. 20380

1 Dr. A. L. Slafkosky
Scientific Advisor (Code AX)
Commandant of the Marine Corps
Washington, D. C. 20380

1 Dr. James J. Regan, Code 55
Naval Training Device Center
Orlando, FL 32813

ARMY

1 Behavioral Sciences Division
Office of Chief of Research and Development
Department of the Army
Washington, D. C. 20310

1 U. S. Army Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory
Commonwealth Building, Room 239
1320 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22209

1 Director of Research
US Army Armor Human Research Unit
ATTN: Library
Bldg 2422 Morande Street
Fort Knox, KY 40121

1 Commanding Officer
ATTN: LTC Cosgrove
USA CDC PASA
Ft. Benjamin Harrison, IN 46249

1 Director
Behavioral Sciences Laboratory
U. S. Army Research Institute of Environmental Medicine
Natick, MA 01760

1 Division of Neuropsychiatry
Walter Reed Army Institute of Research
Walter Reed Army Medical Center
Washington, D. C. 20012

1 Dr. George S. Harker, Director
Experimental Psychology Division
U. S. Army Medical Research Laboratory
Fort Knox, KY 40121

AIR FORCE

1 AFHRL (TR/Dr. G. A. Eckstrand)
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base
Dayton, OH 45433

1 AFHRL (TRT/Dr. Ross L. Morgan)
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base
Dayton, OH 45433

1 AFSOR (NL)
1400 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22209

1 Lt. Col. Robert R. Gerry, USAF
Chief, Instructional Technology Programs
Resources & Technology Division
(DPTBD DCS/P)
The Pentagon (Room 4C244)
Washington, D. C. 20330

1 Headquarters, U. S. Air Force
Chief, Personnel Research and Analysis Division (AF1DPXY)
Washington, D. C. 20330

1 Personnel Research Division (AFHRL)
Lackland Air Force Base
San Antonio, TX 78236

1 Commandant
U. S. Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine
ATTN: Aeromedical Library
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

1 Headquarters, Electronics Systems Division
ATTN: Dr. Sylvia Mayer/MCDS
L. G. Hanscom Field
Bedford, MA 01730

DOD

1 Director of Manpower Research
OASD (M&RA) (M&RU)
Room 3D960
The Pentagon
Washington, D. C. 20301

OTHER GOVERNMENT

1 Mr. Joseph J. Cowan, Chief
Psychological Research Branch (P-1)
U. S. Coast Guard Headquarters
400 Seventh Street, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20591

1 Dr. Alvin E. Goins, Chief
Personality and Cognition Research Section
Behavioral Sciences Research Branch
National Institute of Mental Health
5454 Wisconsin Avenue, Room 10A01
Bethesda, MD 20014

1 Dr. Andrew R. Molnar
Computer Innovation in Education Section
Office of Computing Activities
National Science Foundation
Washington, D. C. 20550

MISCELLANEOUS

1 Dr. Richard C. Atkinson
Department of Psychology
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

1 Dr. Bernard M. Bass
University of Rochester
Management Research Center
Rochester, NY 14627

1 Dr. Lee R. Beach
Department of Psychology
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98105

1 Dr. Mats Bjorkman
University of Umea
Department of Psychology
Umea 6, SWEDEN

1 Dr. Kenneth E. Clark
University of Rochester
College of Arts & Sciences
River Campus Station
Rochester, NY 14627

1 Dr. Jaime Carbonell
Bolt, Bernanek and Newman
50 Moulton Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

1 Dr. Marvin D. Dunnette
University of Minnesota
Department of Psychology
Elliot Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55455

1 Dr. David Weiss
University of Minnesota
Department of Psychology
Elliot Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55455

1 Lawrence B. Johnson
Lawrence Johnson & Associates, Inc.
2001 "S" St. N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20037

1 Dr. E. J. McCormick
Department of Psychology
Purdue University
Lafayette, IN 47907

1 Dr. Robert Glaser
Learning Research and Development Center
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

1 Dr. Albert S. Glickman
American Institutes for Research
8555 Sixteenth Street
Silver Spring, MD 20910

1 Dr. Bert Green
Department of Psychology
Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, MD 21218

1 Dr. Duncan N. Hansen
Center for Computer Assisted Instruction
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306

1 Dr. Richard S. Hatch
Decision Systems Associates, Inc.
11428 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852

1 Dr. M. D. Havron
Human Sciences Research, Inc.
Westgate Industrial Park
7710 Old Springhouse Road
McLean, VA 22101

1 Human Resources Research Organization
Library
300 North Washington Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

1 Human Resources Research Organization
Division #3
Post Office Box 5787
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93940

1 Human Resources Research Organization
Division #4, Infantry
Post Office Box 2086
Fort Benning, GA 31905

1 Human Resources Research Organization
Division #5, Air Defense
Post Office Box 6021
Fort Bliss, TX 77916

1 Human Resources Research Organization
Division #6, Aviation (Library)
Post Office Box 428
Fort Rucker, AL 36360

1 Dr. Robert R. Mackie
Human Factors Research, Inc.
Santa Barbara Research Park
6780 Cortona Drive
Goleta, CA 93017

1 Dr. Stanley M. Nealy
Department of Psychology
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80521

1 Mr. Luigi Petrullo
2431 North Edgewood Street
Arlington, VA 22207

1 Psychological Abstracts
American Psychological Association
1200 Seventeenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

1 Dr. Diane M. Ramsey-Klee
R-K Research & System Design
3947 Ridgemont Drive
Malibu, CA 90265

1 Dr. Joseph W. Rigney
Behavioral Technology Laboratories
University of Southern California
University Park
Los Angeles, CA 90007

1 Dr. George E. Rowland
Rowland and Company, Inc.
Post Office Box 61
Haddonfield, NJ 08033

1 Dr. Robert J. Seidel
Human Resources Research Organization
300 N. Washington Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

1 Dr. Arthur I Siegel
Applied Psychological Services
Science Center
404 East Lancaster Avenue
Wayne, PA 19087